

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 10 and 20 have been amended herein. Claims 1, 10 and 20 as amended are fully supported in the detailed description. No new matter has been added to the specification. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application and Claims.

35 USC 102 Rejection

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Covisint in view of Oracle in view of Kaplan (US Patent 5,701,460). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the cited references do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention as set forth in Claims 1-20.

The Examiner is directed to Claim 1 which is drawn to a method for compressing normal maps in a computer system. Claim 1 is reproduced below in its entirety for the convenience of the Examiner:

1. A multiple exchange instance, comprising:
 - a plurality of exchanges; and
 - a common instance for implementing the exchanges, the exchanges sharing a set of common components and each exchange having a respective view having respective unique components, wherein the common instance comprises a database divided into a plurality of sub-schemas, and wherein each of the exchanges is singularly associated with and implemented within a respective one of the plurality of sub-schemas providing a respective partial view of the common instance, and wherein each of the exchanges is allocated to a different merchant.

Claims 1, 10 and 20 recite limitations similar to those recited in Claim 1. Claims 2-9 depend from Claim 1 and Claims 11-19 depend from Claim 10 and recite additional limitations of embodiments of the claimed invention.

As mentioned above, Covisint in view of Oracle in view of Kaplan does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the claimed invention as set forth in the rejected Claims. Covisint in view of Oracle in view of Kaplan is deficient as Covisint does not teach each of the limitations of the Claims, and Oracle and Kaplan do not remedy the deficiencies of Covisint. In particular, Covisint does not teach or suggest a multiple exchange instance that includes a common instance for implementing a plurality of exchanges “wherein each of the exchanges is singularly associated with and implemented within a respective one of the plurality of sub-schemas providing a respective partial view of the common instance” as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 10 and 20 recite similar limitations). And, Oracle and Kaplan do not teach these limitations to remedy the deficiencies of Covisint.

Claims 1, 10 and 20 have been amended to underscore the relationship between the recited exchanges and the recited sub-schemas (which are a part of a database). In particular, the newly added limitations specify that each of the exchanges is singularly associated with one of the plurality of sub-schemas. Support for the newly added limitations can be found in Applicants’ specification at page 14, lines 10-15 and in Figure 2. It should be appreciated that this limitation (along with the others recited in the Claims) must be taught or suggested by the cited reference in order for a proper prima facie case for rejection to be supported thereby. However, Applicants respectfully submit

that the newly added limitations are not taught or suggested anywhere by Covisint in view of Oracle and Kaplan. If a rejection based on Covisint in view of Oracle and Kaplan is maintained Applicants respectfully request that the location in the references where the aforementioned limitations are taught or suggested be identified.

As understood by Applicants' Covisint discloses a planned automotive e-business trading exchange that is supported by General Motors, Ford and Daimler-Chrysler automotive companies. Moreover, Covisint discloses that the e-business trading exchange will include an integrated exchange for participants in the worldwide automotive industry. The Covisint reference focuses on announcing advantages that will be provided by the exchange but does not indicate that individual exchanges will be associated with a single sub-schema of a database that includes a plurality of sub-schema.

It is important to note that Covisint discusses an "integrated" exchange which suggests a single exchange that provides services for all of its clients (General Motors, Ford, DaimlerChrysler etc.). However, there is no suggestion of how the integrated exchange is to be organized. Accordingly, any allegation that there is a suggestion that individual sub-schemas of a database be associated with individual ones of the recited plurality of exchanges is clearly without justification.

Oracle does not teach or suggest a modification of Covisint that would remedy the deficiencies of Covisint discussed above. In particular, Covisint does not teach or suggest a multiple exchange instance that includes a common instance for implementing a plurality of exchanges "wherein each of the exchanges is singularly associated with and

implemented within a respective one of the plurality of sub-schemas providing a respective partial view of the common instance” as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 10 and 20 recite similar limitations). As understood by Applicants, Oracle discloses an internet enterprise applications suite. Oracle discloses enabling companies to run their operations from a central site in order to lower cost. However, Oracle does not teach or suggest the use of sub-schemas of a database that are associated with individual exchanges.

Kaplan does not teach or suggest a modification of Covisint and Oracle that would remedy the deficiencies of Covisint and Oracle discussed above. In particular, Covisint does not teach or suggest a multiple exchange instance that includes a common instance for implementing a plurality of exchanges “wherein each of the exchanges is singularly associated with and implemented within a respective one of the plurality of sub-schemas providing a respective partial view of the common instance” as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 10 and 20 recite similar limitations). As understood by Applicants, Kaplan discloses an intelligent “joining” system for a relational database. In particular, Kaplan discloses that the system generates a structured query to extract data from a database wherein the database comprises a schema defined by a plurality of record sources and relationships between them. However, as with Covisint and Oracle, Kaplan does not teach or suggest the use of sub-schemas of a database that are associated with individual exchanges.

Based on a review of the Covisint, Oracle and Kaplan references, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere therein is a multiple exchange instance that includes a common instance for implementing a plurality of exchanges “wherein each of the

exchanges is singularly associated with and implemented within a respective one of the plurality of sub-schemas providing a respective partial view of the common instance” as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 10 and 20 recite similar limitations) taught or suggested as is set forth in Claim. Consequently, the embodiments of the present invention as set forth in Claims 1, 10 and 20 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Covisint.

Subject matter recited in dependent claims, such as Claim 2 provide additional examples of the novelty of embodiments of the present claimed invention. In particular, as it regards Claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Covisint is a common instance for implementing a plurality of exchanges that includes the above discussed limitation of Claim 1 and further includes the limitations “wherein the multiple exchanges are implemented within the common instance for facilitating communication between the exchanges” taught or suggested as is recited in dependent Claim 2.

Subject matter recited in dependent claims, such as Claim 3 provide additional examples of the novelty of embodiments of the present claimed invention. In particular, as it regards Claim 3, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in AAPA in view of Chisholm et al. is a method for quantizing normal maps that includes the above discussed limitation of Claim 1 and further includes the limitations “wherein the multiple exchanges each have a respective operator, allowing the operator to perform input/output using the common components to perform the input/output for each of the multiple exchanges” taught or suggested as is recited in dependent Claim 3.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1, 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is improper and that Claims 1, 10 and 20 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-9 dependent on Claim 1 and Claims 11-19 dependent on Claim 10 are likewise in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base Claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that all claims are now in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner. The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES

Dated: July 8, 2008

/Reginald A. Ratliff/
Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No. 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060